Mathijs Koenraadt

The Ignorant God

Thoughts about Time and Eternity

The Ignorant God

Mathijs Koenraadt

The Ignorant God

Thoughts about Time and Eternity

First edition 2017
Copyright © 2017 by Mathijs Koenraadt

Published by Morningtime
www.koenraadt.info

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

Paperback ISBN 978-1548847531
E-book ISBN 978-0463522165

"What is time? Who can easily and briefly explain it? Who even in thought can comprehend it, even to the pronouncing of a word concerning it?"

—Augustine of Hippo

"Time is as eternity and eternity as time,
And so it is you who makes the difference thine."

—Angelus Silesius

Contents

Preface ix

The Ignorant God 1
Afterword 75

Preface

During the month of February 2016, I took several long, solitary walks through Berlin's gray inner city. This winter month, gray, square building blocks in Bauhaus style echoed the depressing Holocaust monument. During the walks, thoughts offered themselves to me that usually have no place in my life. I couldn't let go of thoughts about the nature of our reality, the Nothing, the senses, time and eternity. By sometimes questioning the world around me in a bizarre manner, I tried to unravel what is hidden behind this apparent reality. I processed my raw notes into this short book.

Mathijs Koenraadt, Budapest, June 27, 2017

The Ignorant God

1

The absolute Nothing, which I indicate with a capital letter to prevent confusion with everyday language, doesn't exist, because the Nothing is nothing. Something must be something in order to be able to exist. In a mathematical sense, one can neither compare the Nothing with the value zero, because it isn't that value zero either. The Nothing is absolutely nothing, hence not even zero. The Nothing of which I speak includes the absence of all abstract mathematics and all physical reality. However, there is something that the Nothing definitely is. In order for it to be nothing, the Nothing must be infinite. The Nothing knows no boundaries to its being-nothing. Otherwise, there ought to be something. If the Nothing weren't infinite, then there ought to be something else, namely a Something. The existence of a Something renders the Nothing impossible. The smallest possible Something, an infinitely small thing, instantly cancels out the Nothing. As soon as something exists, the Nothing no longer exists. They exclude each other. The Nothing has to be infinite in its being-nothing. Otherwise, it doesn't exist.

Given the fact that our universe exists, or appears to exist, the universe has entirely canceled out the Nothing. The Nothing no longer exists. There is only Something. There is no more Nothing. Otherwise, we wouldn't be here right now. Would a future man traveling in a special kind of spaceship ever reach the border of our universe, successfully penetrate this border, and, in the strictly hypothetical case, leave the universe undamaged in order to dive into the absolute Nothing, then, looking back over his shoulder, this man would have to conclude that the universe from which he just escaped no longer exists. Seen from the Nothing, which is naturally impossible, our universe doesn't exist. The universe in which we live only exists inside out. Out there, outside of the universe, the universe doesn't exist.

The reality we experience as real has the quality of being a sort of one-way street. It exists from the inside out, but not the other way around. Concerning the Nothing, our universe has never even existed. In order to imagine the true nature of our reality, of the Something that we, human beings, appear to experience as the world around us, it may be helpful to try and imagine this unimaginable Nothing. What do we think about when we think about nothing? That question appears less tough to answer than initially thought once we devise a trick. We picture ourselves a Nothing as a tear in our reality, a tear in space and in time, as if a gateway from our world to the Nothing appears in front of our nose.

With a tear in reality, I don't mean a black hole, but literally a hole in the fabric that represents our reality, whatever that fabric may be. We create this tear toward the Nothing by sawing a chunk out of reality, just as people living on the North Pole sometimes saw a cube out of the ice in order to reach the water below. What, then, do we see through that opening? Can we see through it? We can only carry out this

experiment in thoughts. We can try to imagine how our senses might register this revealed Nothing. What choice of words would people pick to describe the Nothing to one another? The answering of these questions will tell us nothing about the Nothing, though, but it will say something about the nature of our reality. By carrying out the thought experiment, we can determine what our reality, in any case, is not.

2

We have arrived at the fundamental problem of science. Science cannot form "a picture- or theory-independent concept of reality", according to physicist Stephen Hawking in *The Grand Design*. Science really doesn't know anything, let alone that it can tell us anything about what reality is. If science doesn't know, and cannot even know, what reality is, then what is that reality? Why is reality apparently unknowable?

When people talk about the difference between something and nothing, between life and death, light and darkness, existence and non-existence, and so on, we must accept the possibility that it is the human mind that makes such distinctions. The human mind imagines divisions that aren't there in reality. Using the verbal contrast of something versus nothing, we imagine two apparently strictly demarcated things that flow in and out of one another. We call gas and liquid two phase states, for example of water vapor and liquid water, but this difference is by no means qualitative. As water molecules begin bumping into each other faster and faster under a supply of heat, the liquid suddenly transforms into a gas, so we think. Isn't it the case that the human senses interpret this phase difference as such? In reality, nothing

about the water molecules has changed. They have only begun to move faster. Yet, we call the faster movement a gas and the slower movement a liquid. The molecule itself only started moving faster.

Many of our observations prove to be learned ones. The difference between gas and liquid isn't based on altered physical properties of the molecules in question but on a difference in human perception. Human beings teach themselves and others to accept a certain version of reality, at least insofar the senses allow us to do so. Isn't it so that parents tutor their newborn babies in that which they should or shouldn't assume to be true from the very first moments of their lives?

In order to explain that two opposing things can be one and the same thing, we shall go on a journey through time, space and the infinite. Whatever the Nothing may be reveals itself by not being that which people can perceive. We cannot inquire after the true nature of the Nothing, because the Nothing is nothing, but still, the Nothing appears to have its own nature, namely the nature of not having a nature, in other words, the opposite of the nature of the Something. Something is to Nothing that white is to black.

The color black isn't a property of light, but an apparent property of the absence of all light. Without light, people wouldn't have been able to paint a picture of darkness either. Darkness, namely, doesn't exist. We can only experience darkness as the absence of light, but in order to do so, we first had to experience light. Only because there is light can people image both states of darkness and light. Without light, we couldn't have imagined either. A blind mole neither knows darkness nor light, but only warmth and cold. Had mankind evolved underground like a blind mole, then science wouldn't have occupied itself with light and darkness.

We would be so used to the darkness that it wouldn't occur to us to ask whether there could also be light.

A fish that lives out its entire life between the water surface and the ocean floor won't question what seawater is. This fish uncritically accepts the existence of seawater. It doesn't question it. Only when the fish takes a dive into the air above, it learns the difference between water and air. This principle also holds true for human experience. We aren't aware of things we find natural. We only worry about our health when we've fallen ill. As long as we're healthy, neither disease nor health keeps us busy. We are occupied with work or play.

3

We don't often pause to think about it, but the color black doesn't exist. We experience something as having a black color when no light whatsoever reflects into our eyes. Black objects absorb all light. The color black only exists in our own mind. Black is the color our mind has come up with to indicate that something is colorless. The color black appears to be a color but isn't one. Colors are the various frequencies of light that bounce off into our eyes. Black light doesn't exist. Black is the absence of light. Just like the colors red, yellow, blue and white, we call black "the color black", but even the darkest black isn't a color at all. Black is the absence of color. Black is the absence of visible light that reflects into our eyes.

The human mind fools us into believing that the color black is a real color, as if it, too, were a frequency of light. The human mind partly animates an apparent reality, one in which a color black exists that isn't there in reality. Can we

free ourselves from the prison of that apparent reality? Can we create an image of a possible real reality?

Let us attempt to imagine the Nothing. We start with our apparent reality. Can a human being imagine the Nothing, even if only in thoughts? Perhaps a human mind can succeed at forming an image of the Nothing by approximation. The Nothing, so to speak, is something more than merely empty space. The Nothing also isn't that empty space, because the absolute Nothing of which I speak doesn't harbor space. Space and the Nothing exclude each other. If one exists, the other doesn't exist. The absolute Nothing possesses no attributes, because it possesses nothing to attribute anything to. The Nothing has no properties, because it cannot have or be anything. The Nothing doesn't harbor any intrinsic value, because it cannot harbor anything. Everything the Nothing harbors turns into nothing itself. The Nothing has no shape or function and owes nothing to itself because it doesn't have a self either.

Strictly speaking, in a literal sense, the Nothing is that which we can read between the following quotes: "". With that, I neither mean the space on the paper nor the time it cost to read it, but the empty thought behind it. An empty thought is nothing. In fact, the Nothing is less than an empty thought. The Nothing is the absence of a thought. By thinking nothing, we still think, but only by not thinking, we have thought nothing. It seems attractive to represent the Nothing as an empty page, but, paradoxically, that leaves all room for any possibly thinkable thought of the reader. An empty page has the potential to be a work of Shakespeare. In reality, the Nothing isn't an empty page either. The Nothing is absolutely nothing.

Still, this absolute Nothing must have the potential to be Everything. We know that at least one entire universe came

from that Nothing, whether it was created by God or whether it came into being by itself. But how is that possible? How can something that is nothing still carry with it an infinite potential? The fact that the Nothing has the potential to be something more than nothing doesn't stand in the way of defining the absolute Nothing. That's because even that potential only exists in infinitely removed potential. So, that potential isn't there. The Nothing doesn't have potential. That potential exists separately from the Nothing. Then what is that potential?

Apparently, the three basic elements upon which our reality rests are Nothing, Potential, and Something. At this point, the human mind is all tied up when we have to determine that the Nothing must be both infinite in its being-nothing and must simultaneously put forward the infinite potential to be everything. That's quite something. In short, we, human beings, can't imagine this Nothing at all. For convenience, the questionable Nothing serves as a painter's canvas to the creation of a Something, even though that canvas isn't really there either.

4

We don't know what that Nothing is from which our universe supposedly originated. We've stranded in an impossible discussion about meaningless abstractions. Now, let's try to look at the Nothing once more, but this time as seen from our familiar, more understandable universe. Step by step, we peel away the sensory layers of our reality in order to see what our senses then still inform us about. We are going to look up our sensory zero state in order to simulate a pseudo-Nothing.

As mentioned before, in any case, the Nothing will reveal itself to us by having a black color. Not because the Nothing has a color, or that black was a color, but because the absence of all light would appear to give the Nothing a black color. The human senses cannot distinguish between the darkest dark and the Nothing, because neither reflects any light. Precisely because the Nothing doesn't stimulate our senses, people can become aware of the absence of such stimuli. Would we see the Nothing eye to eye, we would be able to recognize it because our senses would register the Nothing as dark and black. We don't really see anything, but our mind makes us aware of the fact that we don't see anything. The apparent color black signals that the eyes are not receiving impulses. The black Nothing reveals itself to us through the absence of those sensory stimuli. This means we can observe something that isn't really there, precisely because it isn't there.

Now that we've switched off the light, we can turn off the heating as well. Know that a person can only feel warmer objects, but not colder ones. Warmer objects send out heat, as do colder ones, but heat always flows from the warmer object to the colder one. This is called the Second Law of Thermodynamics. The law's discovery inspired a belief in the irreversible nature of our reality, namely a belief that time has a direction. The human body can absorb heat from warmer objects. Our nervous tracts signal the brain that external heat has reached our body. Energy has been added to our body. But, technically, we cannot determine the opposite, the sensation of cold, because, in that case, heat leaves our own body, flowing in the direction of the colder object. We cannot feel the cold directly, but only receive a signal sent by our nerves that our body has released heat. We don't feel the cold of the cold object.

Because a tear, in reality, doesn't emit light, nor heat, the tear, therefore, will appear to us as black and cold, despite that the Nothing doesn't possess these attributes at all. The Nothing isn't black or cold, but the Something is heat and light. Our senses register the complete absence of heat and light as black and cold. This belongs to the zero state of our own senses. In the absence of light and heat stimuli, we experience an object as cold and black. The Nothing must appear to us that way too. The black and the cold are sensory signals for the absence of the Something.

We continue to try and imagine a tear in reality, one that exposes the Nothing behind it. Seen from our perspective, the thing we observe through this tear would have to have a deep black color and feel terribly cold, exactly at the absolute zero point of slightly less than 273 degrees below zero degrees Celsius. Yet, this cold, black thing doesn't exist, because it is Nothing. What we observe isn't the Nothing itself, but the absence of everything else that makes itself known as such to our senses. In particular, this emptiness in the Something, which we experience as the Nothing, hits at a hole in our sensory perception. The unimaginable Nothing manifests itself as a hole in our mind.

5

One early morning in autumn, I was gazing over a grassland in the Dutch province of Utrecht. In the distance, at the end of a green meadow, a herd of cows was walking in front of a long row of trees. Once I had gotten closer, the low-hanging morning sun was hanging right behind the thick tree trunk of one of these trees. I took a photo of it. Because the bright sunlight shone from behind the tree trunk, it produced a

photographic effect whereby the dark yellow sunlight surrounds the tree's dark silhouette like an aureole.

I only understood later that, under these conditions, I hadn't photographed the tree itself at all, but only its shadow. The photo showed the green grass, covered with frost and dew, the trees to the left and right of the tree that stood in the middle of the photo, and the sunlight that tried to escape from behind it, as well as the clouds and the soft atmosphere above it. It was all there in the photo, except for that middlemost tree behind which the sun had hidden. In the picture, I could only see a dark silhouette of that tree. The photo showed me the shadow of the tree that had been cast directly into the camera. The sunlight hadn't first been able to bounce into the lens via the surface of the tree. Under these conditions, I couldn't really see the tree, even though I saw its silhouette. The silhouette appeared to be a tree. Only by the silhouette could I determine that this tree was a tree. I perceived a tree, not because of what I could perceive, but because of what I couldn't perceive.

The tree's silhouette struck a hole in the sunlight. The silhouette acted as an apparent tear in reality. This phenomenon is of importance to a progressive understanding of the true nature of our reality. Where did our reality originate from? The word originate says that something came from somewhere, in this case, a reality from Nothing. But the human preoccupation with the origination of a universe from Nothing distracts from the possibility that our reality doesn't necessarily have to have a history of origin. Instead of a creation event, our reality doesn't rule out that the Something may perhaps be an imprint in the Nothing, like a footprint in wet sand. If we imagine this sand as being the Nothing, would we be able to leave a footprint in it too? Could our re-

ality be less than nothing, an imprint in the Nothing? Might the origin of our reality be a negative phenomenon?

6

Suppose we are observing an optimal solar eclipse, a theoretically optimal eclipse that doesn't reflect a single beam of sunlight into our eyes from the front surface of the moon. The moon perfectly hides behind its black silhouette, like the tree in my photo. In such a case, we cannot say that we see the moon, but we only see the silhouette of the moon. Seen from the sun, no sunlight bounces off the backside of the moon into our eyes. The moon's silhouette is the solar eclipse (the sun disappears behind the moon) that simultaneously is the lunar eclipse (hidden from us in its own silhouette). In this setup, we can neither see the moon nor the sun. All we see is the escaping sunlight that bends around the moon's silhouette.

The fact that we say we can see the solar eclipse in our everyday language betrays that our rational mind has difficulty expressing reality. The mind of the sensually gifted person ties together external impressions, filters them, analyses them and shapes them, but the final result can only be called a limited projection of reality. For now, we still assume that this reality is really there. The human mind, imprisoned in itself, can never contact the outside world directly. There's a delay in the digestion of all stimuli that is also incomplete. Does our mind perhaps play a role in animating reality?

In order to see the moon during a solar eclipse, we have to believe in the apparent reality that there really is a real moon hiding behind the dark silhouette. At that moment, our senses cannot determine the existence of that moon. It

is the human mind that suggests the existence of the moon, namely on the basis of an earlier memory of that moon. During a solar eclipse, we need the memory of the moon in order to be able to continue to believe in the existence of that sun and moon, which have both been cast into a shadow by the light blockade.

That exposes a crucial limitation of the human sensibility. We can only understand something in relation to something else. Our understanding of reality appears to be a relative ability. Without memories of a past, our reality would look very different. We would no longer understand a thing of it. Our ability to remember is very limited and differs from person to person. That's why no two people process their sensory stimuli in exactly the same manner. No two people perceive reality in exactly the same way, because no two people have the same memories.

Just as the tree's silhouette, the moon that eclipses the sun acquaints us, from a great distance, with an apparent tear to the Nothing. We perceive the apparent Nothing as a Something that neither absorbs light nor reflects sunlight, because, in this case, the sun doesn't shine on it. This thing, imperceptible to the human senses, characterizes itself by having a black color, the dark moon we temporarily cannot see. The apparent dark moon represents the lack of light reflection. Perfectly black objects don't have a color, because they don't reflect light into our eyes, just as the dark moon that eclipses the sun.

What we experience as color is twofold, in any case. On the one hand, the actual light hitting our eyes from the outside, and, on the other hand, the interpretation our mind attaches to it. There is a delay between the observable reality and our sensory understanding of it. Above all, our eyes aren't very impressive. There are many frequencies of light that

our eyes cannot convert into vibrations understandable to the brain. People will perceive infrared and ultraviolet light as dark black. Because of our limited sensory abilities, there's a large part of the observable reality that we cannot observe. Perhaps there may even be another reality right in front of our nose, but we will never see it, simply because we do not possess senses with a proper refinement. We live in a sensory-centric reality.

Our senses give color to what we call reality. Other life forms possess very different eyes and observe the same thing we observe in a different manner. Such more primitive minds perceive a different color palette that only partially overlaps with that of people. Some animals see infrared and ultraviolet. Horses don't see color, but a grayscale, and they and others have a broader range of vision. The differences in sensory quality mean that different life forms, as well as different individuals, are forced to perceive the same reality differently. The mind of an ant interprets sunlight in a different way than people do. But who says that people see things the right way? The belief that the human senses correctly represent reality, but those of other animals or insects do not, is called anthropocentrism, the belief that people see things better.

Even if there would exist a real reality, different life forms would not only perceive them differently, but their minds would interpret that reality in different ways as well. The question remains whether man and his scientific equipment can puncture through that barrier.

What about creatures that don't have any senses at all, but only respond to the outside world using chemicals? Because nothing in this universe can perceive reality as it really is, we must conclude that it makes no difference to the observer whether that reality is really real or whether it is apparent. The apparent reality is the only one we will ever

know. More so, a possible real reality doesn't allow itself to be known. It is unknowable. That has consequences for the origin of our universe. Would a God have created the universe, then it wouldn't have been necessary to build the physical universe brick by brick, but it would have sufficed to create the appearance of it. Is God trying to fool us?

The aforementioned scenario begs the question whether there is a distinction between the Nothing and the absence of all sensory impulses. Is it really reality that stimulates our senses, or is it our own mind that simulates such stimuli? Are we confusing cause and consequence in our heads?

In absence of external influences, man would exist in a similar state as when he would really be able to exist in the Nothing and survive. With his eyes, he would perceive the black, namely the absence of light. With his skin, he would feel nothing, with his nose, he would smell nothing, and with his mouth, he would taste nothing. Yet, under that condition, the mind can bring to light all sorts of memories. Blind people can sometimes see shapes their own minds are recalling. In this apparent Nothing, in which there is nothing to see, the human mind can fool its owner to see all sorts of things.

Under such illusion-inducing circumstances, a gifted mind could reel off a movie as if the scenes were really occurring, including all the feelings, emotions, heat, cold, taste and smell. How would this person ever be able to determine the difference between his self-induced, simulated reality and an apparently real reality, if he cannot distinguish between either of both realities? Even more so, both realities would have come about in the same manner, namely through the mind's imagination.

The Nothing doesn't have to be anything more than the absence of all sensory input. According to science, which pre-

supposed a real reality outside of human beings, the Nothing has to be something more than that. According to science, the Nothing ought to be more than the absence of human beings, but an absence of the physical universe. Science believes that reality can exist separately from man, but what evidence does science offer to support this assumption? Thus, we arrive at the question that every philosopher, theologian, and scientist has on his mind. Is there really a real reality outside of man, or is man inseparably linked to this apparent reality?

To our mind, in any case, it makes no difference. In either case, in the absence of all sensory stimuli, we would no longer be able to perceive our existence. At the very most, we would have become a stationary thought, an empty mind that, for the lack of stimuli, would no longer be able to think.

7

Is there still a Nothing outside of the universe? Does a sort of membrane surround the entire universe that keeps out the Nothing, or is the universe, taken as a whole, a form of infinite energy that doesn't leave any room for the Nothing? We return to the point that it is the human mind that divides reality into a Something and a Nothing. Some people will suggest that the Nothing also exists (or doesn't exist) without our senses so that the difference between reality and non-reality is real and that man is part of a tangible reality that will continue to exist even without him. That is the scientific belief in a measurable reality. This belief implies that tangible things don't need an observer for them to exist.

The other school of thought says that, in absence of an observer, all that which man could have observed ceases to exist. The creation doesn't live on without its creator, but, the

other way around, with the destruction of its creation, the creator ceases to exist as well. These questions form the starting points for the debate whether there is something like a real reality. Does a Something exist or is reality but a thought of the Nothing?

8

Objects people perceive as light reflect more light than objects they perceive as dark. But then what happens to the light that hits black objects? If these objects don't reflect the light, they will have to absorb it. Then they will either have to heat up and subsequently emit the light as heat radiation, or they will have to perform other, perhaps chemical reactions which again release types of energy or matter. Or, they transform the light into frequencies the human eye cannot see.

Unlike black objects, the absolute Nothing can neither absorb light nor reflect it as wavelengths visible to man. Would we really open a tear to the Nothing, what would happen to the light that shines onto the Nothing from our reality? It would neither bounce off nor be absorbed. That light would have to disappear from our reality entirely and impoverish our universe proportionally. This idea disappoints, because if the light that shines on a tear to the Nothing could disappear just like that, then why does the universe we live in expand itself? Shouldn't the light from our stars then hit a membrane somewhere and disappear? What is that magical membrane at the edge of our universe that does help the universe expand, but still lets the light stop precisely there? Or is it the light that pushes that membrane forward?

Such a membrane doesn't exist. Nothing stops the Nothing, and yet the Something has consistently beaten

the Nothing for billions of years now. Why doesn't the entire Something suddenly fall back into the Nothing from which the Something should have originated? If the Something can push the Nothing out of the way by filling it with light, namely by filling in something that didn't exist before, without erasing itself in the process, then it is impossible that light can shine on a tear to the Nothing. The light from our reality that would shine on the tear to the nothing would have to fill in this Nothing with its own Something. The Something would have to expand itself into the Nothing, just as apparently is happening at the edge of our universe. The experiment to mentally open a tear to the Nothing can impossibly take place in reality. Then what is that Nothing, if it is not really there, and if there is only the Something and not the Nothing? What is the meaning of it that the presence of the Something has already canceled out the Nothing?

Would the light that shines on a tear to the Nothing disappear, thus withdraw itself from reality, then the entire universe would have to bleed out immediately at the slightest rupture. Yet, this doesn't happen. Reality didn't tear, not even once. Despite black holes, our universe doesn't bleed out at once. The canvas of a cinema screen can tear, but our reality apparently cannot. What kind of thing can't possibly tear? A thought cannot tear. Reality isn't physical, but mental.

9

Another way of picturing the Nothing is by trying to imagine the absence of space. Aside from being black and cold, the imaginary tear to the Nothing must also be impenetrable. Without space, nothing can move in the Nothing. According to our senses, the Nothing would appear to be a kind of

matter of an infinite density, a matter with an infinitely heavy weight, because we cannot displace it. Again, that isn't really the case. The Nothing has no weight or density. It is our senses that would depict a tear in reality as such. This is related to the fact that the Nothing also doesn't know time. If there's no time, nothing can move in it. If nothing can move, nothing can penetrate the Nothing. That suggests that the Something weighs less than the Nothing.

How can we mentally pause time? With stationary time, we think of a movie we can pause, but the Nothing doesn't know stationary time either. There exists no time in the Nothing. Hypothetically removing space seems to be something our three-dimensional brains can hardly imagine. A perfectly flat screen occupies a two-dimensional space, but we must even ignore that space in order to imagine the Nothing. The Nothing is less than a one-dimensional point.

In an empty box, there is still air and light, smell and color, as well as other forms of energy and substance. Were we to remove the air, we would call that vacuum, the space in which astronauts can move freely. In that world of astronauts, there's still a little bit of gravity, energy, matter, time, heat and other things, but even space itself is still in that space. Let us cool down that space to the point of zero degrees Kelvin, the absolute zero point. Then, all heat will have been disappeared from it. Nothing can move by itself anymore. There is no more energy in the box. Next, we turn off the light in the box. It is absolutely dark, absolutely cold, nothing still makes a sound, nothing gives off a smell, nothing moves. Still, there's something left in the box: time and space.

Albert Einstein discovered that time and space are one and the same thing: spacetime. Without time, there can be no space, but what about stationary time? Is there still room, then, for a sort of eternal snapshot? Could an object in space,

in which time stands still, still exist? We assume so, but what would happen to physical objects at the moment time in a space has stopped? Such matter would neither be able to explode nor implode because there's nothing left that can move anymore. The explosion wouldn't be able to take place. By stopping time, we have nullified spacetime.

What is the difference between stationary time and no time?

We now approximately understand what the Nothing is. Despite that the Nothing is nothing, our senses signal the absence of Something as a cold, black, timeless, immovable, infinitely heavy, impenetrable flat wall. The Nothing appears to our eyes as perfectly black, to our touch as perfectly cold, to our nose as perfectly odorless, to our hearing as perfectly quiet, to our taste as perfectly tasteless. To our minds as a black impermeability. That's why it's so hard for us to image the Nothing. As human beings, we can only imagine the Nothing as an absence of our own sensory stimuli. The Nothing is nothing.

The difference between Something and Nothing lives in our own head. Our senses present us an apparent reality, regardless of whether that reality is real. Do we even exist?

The experiment to try and imagine the Nothing has been useful. It brings us to a categorization of reality. Firstly, there's the sensory reality, namely the image of a possibly real reality as it comes into being in each of us. This is the reality of smell, sound, touch, sight, and taste, tied together by our mind. In other words, the movie our brains play before us. Secondly, there is the measurable reality scientists presuppose. In other words, the mathematical, chemical and physical reality that supposedly came into being outside of man. Except, science hasn't yet proven the actuality of that reality. It assumes it without evidence. Thirdly, there's the real reality, if it indeed

exists, that should control both our sensory as well as our scientific realities. But a possible real reality doesn't have to look like the scientific one. The scientific reality is a subset of the real one.

10

In some places of the universe, scientists discovered that time moves faster than elsewhere. They showed this to be true here on Earth. Because the Earth isn't perfectly spherical, but somewhat flattened around the poles, a ribbon around the equator measures a longer distance than a ribbon around both poles. It means that gravity isn't the same all over the world, but differs depending on where someone is located. Around the equator, someone weighs slightly more than on the North or South Pole. The difference in gravity influences time. Using atomic clocks, scientists determined that time elapses slower at the poles than around the equator. The difference is very small but consistent.

Time and gravity aren't constant anywhere, but as changeable as water. The Nothing doesn't possess time at all. Our senses would perceive time behind the tear to the Nothing as stationary time. The absolute Nothing, of course, doesn't know time, nor stationary time, but our senses cannot register absence of time, only stationary time.

Time only exists within the universe or within the Something. But if time can have varying speeds, is stationary time the same thing as the absence of time? Does time disappear as soon as time is stopped? Did time originate from the Nothing in order to put the Something in motion, or did time come into being simultaneous with the first Something within which time began to run? Did time evolve from the

Something later? Did the universe give birth to time after its origination? Can Something exist without time as well? We can't easily answer these questions, among other things because science, as is the case with reality, doesn't know what time is. Even Einstein didn't know what time was. He took it for granted. Philosopher Martin Heidegger demonstrated that people have based the concept of time on empty assumptions since the beginning of human history.

We'll have to figure out what time is ourselves. Perhaps we can do so by using philosophy. Or perhaps with another thought experiment. Because the absolute Nothing doesn't know time, but only the infinity of its being-nothing, we can approximately imagine the timelessness that the Nothing brings along. Let's imagine a place on Earth where time begins to run slower and slower, just as long until time has stopped entirely. Imagine, for example, a living room with a family. Outside, from the street side, we peek inside the family's home through a big window. While time in the living room is slowing down, members of the family appear to be moving ever slower, up to the point where the family appears to have stopped entirely. To us outsiders, at least.

Let's assume for convenience that everything except light is standing still, so that we may keep shining a light into the living room from the outside and so that we may be able to continue to observe the stationary inner world. That wouldn't be possible otherwise. Without time, namely, light doesn't move either and we can't see anything. In reality, we would no longer be able to observe the inside of a stationary space, because the photons in that space have also stopped and we can no longer receive sensory stimuli into our eyes. In this experiment, we cheat a little. We will soon neutralize that trick again.

Would we be allowed to cheat for a moment, then the family in the living room would appear to stand still perfectly and forever, as indestructible statues. Yet, the family members would be just as alive as ever. Seen from their own perspective, nothing has changed.

Without the light we were allowed to shine inside, the living room would appear to be a black box. The window through which we would be looking might possibly reflect our own light as a sort of mirror. Perhaps the light that we would shine inside through the room would accumulate itself in front of the window because the light ends up stuck in a traffic jam of photons. Would we speed up time in the living room again, then the family would have to experience that accumulated light as a sudden explosion of light, which might be so hot it would burn them.

In the above example, time in the living room is stationary, while people on the street side experience normal time (as we know it). But if there exists stationary time, then the family wouldn't have noticed it. Time is reality. To the family, time just went on.

What exactly is the difference between stationary time and no time? Isn't that the same thing? To this, we add yet another category: time we slow down in such a way that it infinitely approaches a perfect standstill, but which never actually stands still absolutely. This time I call infinitely slow time. This runs slightly faster than stationary time, but the difference between both is so infinitely small that no person could detect this difference. The four scenario's of time we must study are: 1. normal time, time as we experience it this very moment; 2. stationary time that is still time; 3. absent time (no time); and 4. infinitely slow time that approaches its own standstill to infinity, but which never quite stands still.

What would be the effect of these four scenarios on the inhabitants of the living room? In the fourth scenario, the infinitely slowed down time, the inhabitants would, hypothetically speaking, seen from their own perspective, be able to continue their daily lives. Inside the living room, things move at a speed quite understandable to them. Relatively speaking, there's nothing out of the ordinary going on inside the living room, except it would appear to them as if the outside world had been infinitely accelerated.

If time outside the living room accelerates infinitely, that would mean the members of the family would approach the end of our universe in a fraction of a moment. They would disintegrate at once, disappear, perish alongside the universe, collapsing into the Nothing. Had the room they were in been indestructible, they would have experienced the downfall of our Milky Way and the collapse of our universe up to the point of falling back into the Nothing. All of this would have occurred as if in a flash.

But to outsiders, the family in this scenario would have appeared to have stood still in an indestructible living room. Outsiders would not have been able to notice the difference between stationary time and infinitely approximated stationary time. The difference is too small to measure, even for scientific instrumentation. This is an important insight because it means that stationary time and infinitely slowed down time are perceived as one and the same thing by an outsider who lives in normal time. It doesn't matter to the outsider whether something is literally nothing or approximately nothing. The human senses perceive both situations as nothing.

The concept Infinity must play a crucial role in our reality because it doesn't matter to the observer whether the Nothing is absolutely nothing or whether it is only nothing by an infinite approximation! That means: perhaps there has

never been a Nothing and there always had been an infinitely small almost-nothing, namely a Something.

As we saw in the experiment about time acceleration, the inhabitants of the special living room cannot consciously register an acceleration or a deceleration of time, but only in relative comparison to the world around them. Now imagine two of such living rooms with a glass wall in between them, so that the inhabitants can observe each other. In the one room A we accelerate time, until it runs twice as fast as in the other room B. This special experiment confronts the observers in both rooms with the problem that neither of them can determine in which room time was sped up or slowed down. It is also possible that time had been slowed down or sped up in the other room. Judging by each other's condition, they cannot see which room was accelerated or which one decelerated. They can only see each other's relative speed difference, but they cannot determine the source of that difference.

If we accelerate time in room A, the people in room A won't notice anything at all. To them, it will appear as if the people in room B had been slowed down. It is impossible for the inhabitants to determine with certainty who was sped up or who was slowed down. It is also possible that both rooms are partially accelerated and slowed down so that there exist two sources of the time difference. To the inhabitants, it is only possible to determine which room is running faster than the other, but it is impossible to determine that room A was supposedly accelerated in comparison to room B, or that room B was supposedly decelerated in relation to the room A. Relative time means that there doesn't have to be absolute time. There doesn't have to exist an absolute zero state of time.

Seen through the eyes of the observers, the families who still experience their own time as unchangeable, to themselves and to the observation of their own room nothing changed. If the speed at which time ran would double everywhere in the entire universe, nobody would know about it, because, relative to each other, everything would continue to move at the same speed differences. Scientists wouldn't be able to measure it either, because both they and their measuring equipment would have been accelerated with time. Relatively speaking, a difference in experienced time cannot be observed anywhere. The inhabitants of the rooms can only observe that time in the adjacent room is running either faster or slower.

This differs from how we experience temperature. If the temperature drops too far, we freeze. We feel that it is becoming colder. But we cannot feel a time retardation. If time in our living room is slowed down, at first we would not notice it, at least for as long we do not have a benchmark, such as for example an adjacent room with people who, at least from our point of view, appear to be accelerating.

11

The concept of experienced time, namely the consciousness of time bound to a person, which we always experience at the same speed regardless of acceleration or deceleration, offers the bizarre insight that the human perception must possess a constant processing speed. Someone who travels to the past in a time machine, as seen in the movies, still lives in his own time, which, apparently, is experienced as a constant. It is not the case that we become younger when we travel back in time

in a time machine; we become older. We bring our own time with us on a journey through time.

We can travel to the future in at least two ways. Firstly, by speeding up time outside of our time machine. Secondly, by slowing down time inside the time machine. In both cases, travelers inside the time machine wouldn't notice a thing about the difference. To them, time inside the time capsule would have remained unchanged throughout the journey. It is not the case that they would have experienced themselves in slow-motion in the second scenario. No, they would have experienced the outside world in acceleration. Thus, time travelers in such a capsule cannot determine whether the outside world was accelerated or whether they themselves were decelerated.

Besides, it isn't possible to travel back in time in this manner. Regardless of whether we speed up or slow down time, we still always go forward. A time machine that can travel to the future seems to be relatively easy to build, namely by freezing time within the time capsule, so that the passengers survive their environment, while this environment rapidly ages. But traveling back in time means that the entire universe's film reel must be wound back. That has nothing to do with time, but with space. In order to travel back in time, we must rewind the film of the entire physical universe. Forward is time, backward is space, but according to Einstein time and space are one and the same thing, spacetime.

That says something about the nature of what we call reality. Our senses process the reality we live in at a fixed, constant speed, irrespective of whether time in our own reality, for example in our living room, was accelerated or decelerated, not even if this was infinitely accelerated or decelerated. How is that possible? What is this mysterious constant? In the world of computers, one would call it the processor

speed, but in that case, we have to ask ourselves whether different individuals are walking around with different processors. Would some people perhaps have a slower time processor and others a faster one? I don't think so. The constant we look for is simply the speed of light that shoots through all people in the form of electrons at an equal speed. Why does light even have a speed? What slows it down?

The question of what time is depends on the answer to the question why the light appears to have a speed at all. Is it also possible that light is just stationary and everything else bends around it?

Imagine a sort of tube with a diameter of, for example, one meter that reaches from the Earth to the moon. Inside the tube, time has been infinitely accelerated. In case we transmit a beam of light to the surface of the moon outside of the tube, it would take about 1.26 seconds for this beam to reach its destination at the speed of light. If we shine the same beam of light through the infinitely accelerated time tube, to an outsider, this will de facto immediately reach the moon surface, but not because the light in the tube is really going faster. Inside the tube, the light still has the same speed as outside the tube. It is the time that we have accelerated, not the light. To an outsider, the light seems to be going faster through the tube, but a measurement instrument on the inside of the tube would inform us that it, too, had taken about 1.26 seconds to reach the surface of the moon.

Now we repeat the same experiment with a moon traveler. Suppose a journey to the moon using a rocket takes about thirty days. An observer departs from the Earth and arrives there thirty days later. At the same time, another traveler using an equally fast rocket traveled to the moon through a time tube, meaning a tube in which time had been infinitely accelerated. Seen from his own perspective, this second trav-

eler will also have traveled for thirty days, despite that to the regular traveler he had arrived at the moon within a fraction of a moment. The traveler inside the tube can show this by bringing along a clock. That clock will show that his journey, too, had taken those thirty days, i.e. just as long as to the traveler outside the tube. Still, from the perspective of the outsider, the tube traveler arrived at the moon immediately after departure. Still, upon leaving the tube, the faster moon traveler will have aged thirty days in relation to his colleague who is still left in starting position on Earth. The tube traveler will wonder why time on Earth had apparently stood still for thirty days.

The purpose of these thought experiments is to clarify that the relative speed of time doesn't influence our personal observation speed in any way. At no time has the apparent faster tube traveler experienced time as faster. Only upon leaving the tube has he discovered that time on Earth had stood still, while he himself had aged thirty days. It is this human processing speed, or time processor speed, that intrigues me. Whatever time may be, time acceleration or deceleration doesn't touch us personally. It produces an interesting question: does time exist?

12

As mentioned before, according to Albert Einstein, time and space are one and the same thing, spacetime. What kind of consequences does this insight have to the aforementioned four scenarios of time? If time and space are one and the same thing, then, with the absence of time, space would no longer exist either. In case of infinitely decelerated time, space should also have infinitely approached the Nothing. The

same is true in case of stationary time. Then what is stationary space, space through which nothing can move? Stationary space isn't space, but nothing. Objects that we can fire at space with stationary time wouldn't be able to pass through it. This space would be impenetrable because stationary time no longer allows for movement. This space would appear to have an infinite density, harder than the hardest materials we can find in the universe, despite the fact that this stationary space would be completely empty.

Isn't it surprising that precisely this Nothing is stronger than anything we can find in the universe?

Regardless of how much we accelerate or decelerate time in our living room, we experience time as an unchangeable constant. Only outsiders looking through our window see us move in a faster or slower manner. Time knows a person-bound base speed. Is it possible that such a base speed of reality, that must be equal to the processor speed of the human sensory perception, both related to the speed of light, betrays that this didn't come into being outside man, but precisely from within, as part of the projection that the mind presents to us?

Is it possible that our physical lives have already passed, or have never even taken place, while our mental projection is still busy winding itself off, alongside all the feelings and all the pain we think to experience with it? Is it possible that our future has already taken place, but that we see the experience appear before our retinas afterward and in a delayed manner?

At first sight, the speed of light would have to determine the processing speed of electrons in our nerve paths. We can never perceive reality faster than the speed of light allows us. What power or force determines the speed of light, which thereby determines our sensory perception speed? Scientists describe the universe with constants, but cannot point out

where those constants would be recorded. If those constants are not recorded anywhere, then why are they constants? What enforces that constancy? Does the universe have a software and a hardware? It appears to be a part of the machinery behind reality, a machinery science has not yet begun to measure. Could it also be possible that it is the human perception that keeps reality moving?

We conclude that, with stationary time, time ceases to exist. There is no such thing as stationary time or stationary space. Those are both equal to the Nothing. On the other hand, though, there is time that can be slowed down to infinity. Moreover, we might be living in such an infinitely slowed down universe. The difference between no time and regular time only has to be infinitely small in order to allow for the existence of our universe. It means that the difference between Nothing and Something only has to be infinitely small—negligible. We don't need faster time but can advance with infinitely slow time as well. Time is dichotomous: it is either on or off. We don't need open space, because we can also move in infinitely tight space. The difference, in other words, doesn't really exist. Something is as good as Nothing.

Time, it seems, isn't a condition for the origination of Something, but the simultaneous consequence of it. Are time and space both a thought?

13

Because we can only perceive reality through our senses, it doesn't matter to our processing ability what reality's true nature would be. Whether it is apparent or real, in both cases we experience the same reality. With its equipment, science can wipe away the human observer from its equations, but

that doesn't mean at all that such equipment is measuring a real reality. That equipment is itself part of a possible apparent reality. In that case, all science is apparent science.

How real is reality? The bulk of space in the universe is dark, cold empty space. The largest part of our universe represents so little that it really doesn't represent anything at all. The universe consists of practically empty space, in which nothing happens, through which no light shines, where no heat can be found. The most part of the universe infinitely approaches the Nothing. In such places, only the infinitely decelerated spacetime could still exist. But if nothing happens in that empty spacetime, neither movement nor change, would we have to attribute it to the Something or to the Nothing? Once again, the ambiguity about this betrays that it is man himself who makes the distinction between Something and Nothing.

Given the enormous size of our universe, and given the enormous share that the Emptiness occupies in that universe, the difference between the Nothing and the Something, on average, will have to approach each other infinitely. The Something is almost Nothing. It isn't necessary either that there ought to be more. The difference between reality as we experience it and the Nothing is infinitely small. The energy of all the stars in the universe, the matter of all the planets and all other celestial bodies combined hardly make a dent in comparison to the baffling size of the otherwise so empty universe. On average, that universe is so big that the amount of matter hardly exists. As the universe expands, the volume share of all matter approaches an infinitely small value. In comparison to the universe, the Something that we experience as physical reality approaches the Nothing.

The bigger mystery isn't so much how the universe and all its enormous Emptiness came into being, but how some-

thing more than Emptiness originated at all: energy, matter, milky ways, supernovae, black holes, gravity, and so on. Or actually, why so little? Why does the ratio of physical matter to empty space in the universe lean toward empty space? Why is so much Emptiness necessary in order to fill a little bit of Something with matter? Suppose the universe continues to expand indefinitely, then we can even take into account the factor time. If we would extend the age of our universe into infinity, then the ratio physical matter to empty space would really approach the Nothing infinitely.

Is that perhaps why we must experience time because our entire existence would otherwise have been over in an infinitely short flash? Time buffers the perception of reality.

Concerning space, we are being fooled by our senses. We experience a spaciousness that isn't really there. In any case, the three-dimensional feeling that our mind produces for us doesn't rely on assumed dimensions of the outside world. It is our own mind that evolved in this universe and learned to represent certain energy, the spacetime, as spaciousness. Outside of that projection in our head, there is no three-dimensional spaciousness. Spacetime is nothing other than a form of energy, but certainly no physical reality.

Our mind processes the impulses that reach us through our five senses. That's what we'll have to work with. The reality we experience comes into being in our own head because we can never make direct contact with a possibly real reality. There's a delay between the stimulus, the nerve impulse that passes the stimulus on, and the mind that processes the impulse into an understandable image of reality. Moreover, that mind does so on the basis of earlier experiences and memories. The same stimulus arouses a different reality in each individual person. Space resembles an energy that reveals itself to our senses as spaciousness. Spaciousness is a form of

energy that our senses translate into an illusion of space. In our head, we experience a spaciousness of the world around us that is not really there.

This is apart from the question of whether there is a real reality. The spaciousness, in any case, isn't real, but apparent. We are not three-dimensional bodies, but only experience it that way. We are de facto spirits that are in contact with each other through some other way.

14

The question remains whether the human mind simultaneously projects reality as well as itself. Do we really exist outside of ourselves or are we ourselves projection? The three-dimensional space that we think we are observing doesn't leave any room at all for our own physical spaciousness. We aren't bodies, but we are rather swimming in a sea of energy like electric fish. It is the imagination of the human mind that creates the reality around it each moment anew.

Would our mind really animate itself and its reality at the same time, then both observer and observation ought to be one and the same thing. It is the human mind that makes the difference, meaning self-deception. I doubt whether a dragonfly or another insect can consider itself a clearly defined creature. Insects and other simple life forms will only experience themselves as part of larger flows of energy. They don't possess the discerning consciousness in order to understand themselves as a delineated body, separate from the rest of reality. Only people and perhaps some mammals can observe themselves and others as individuals. Insects and other, more primitive life forms experience themselves as part of a col-

lective. It is the discerning mind of mental beings that again applies a distinction where there isn't really a distinction.

According to this scenario, in which the observer observes himself and consequently animates himself first, we are forever imprisoned by ignorance, just as a camera lens that both transmits and registers. Such a lens cannot observe itself. Such a lens only sees in one direction, outward. A camera cannot film itself directly, only via a mirror. In this case, the reflection in the mirror is a false projection of the lens and not a representation of the real lens. Although the observer can distinguish between the observing lens and the observable projection, it can never observe itself. The projector that transmits and receives does not see itself.

Man solves this problem by invoking God. Along a philosophical, theological and scientific road, we succeed at reasoning about morals, knowledge, and ethics, drafting laws and separating good from evil. However, we do not succeed at knowing the source of this distinction between good and evil. Basically, good and evil are human behavior, meaning human judgment about behavior. This judgment differs per situation and often from person to person, from perspective to perspective. It is man who applies his own ordering between good and evil, although this ordering isn't really there. This theme often returns. It is man who looks at a planet and believes to perceive a North and a South Pole, even though such north-south concepts are complete fiction as seen from the universe.

That's why people shift the burden of this dilemma to a higher authority, the Almighty, the Ancestor, Mother Nature, the Prophet, Heidegger's Metaphysics or the Scientific Method. None of these pseudo-solutions can solve human ignorance. Man as an observer cannot know himself. Igno-

rance about his true nature is the price man has to pay for his existence.

The authority that legitimizes our own authority lies outside of us. For that reason, we are forced to believe in a God or to apply other resources as a substitute for God. A human being can question the authority of another human being and has no trouble doing so, but he cannot question the authority of an inherently irrefutable abstraction. It is neither possible to prove the existence of God, nor to disprove it. In this sense, God, Reality and the Scientific Method are one and the same thing. We can attack a neighbor, but we cannot attack abstractions such as God, Nature or the Big Bang. First of all, that makes no sense, and second of all, it isn't possible to resist such abstractions, because both the existence and non-existence thereof are unprovable. I call this *deflection*, the attitude that we leave the final judgment of our moral acts to an improvable abstraction.

15

The space we live in is an illusion of spaciousness animated by mental energy, the way that our senses interpret it in hindsight with a time delay. We already live in the future but are still responding to the past. At the moment our mind has interpreted a certain reality, which we experience as the Now, this reality no longer exists. Think of an airplane that passes by at a great distance. As soon as we hear the sound of the engines, the airplane is no longer where it should be according to our hearing. But even between our ears, our nerves, and the mental stimulus processing, there are still extra delays.

What we experience as the Now is already in the past. Our senses cannot process the present quickly enough. The

human senses project a reality that can no longer be real since this already lies in the past. The human sensory system can impossible observe the real reality directly, but only with a delay. From a practical point of view, what use does it still have for us to speak of a real reality? Man lives in his own head and cannot escape from it. There is nothing to escape to.

The five senses (regardless of the categorization), smell, sight, hearing, touch, taste, shape the apparent reality the mind falsifies into an illusion of a real reality. Moreover, just like ants, moles, fish, and so on, in comparison to the complexity of the universe, we only possess a very limited sensory ability. Seen from the point of view of the universe, the difference between human intelligence and that of ants is negligibly small. That may surprise many, but to an infinitely intelligent God, man is, relatively speaking, no smarter than a dolphin or a chimpanzee. Even if we had an IQ of 150 and chimpanzees one of 50, compared to an infinitely large IQ that is of insignificant importance. We don't have to delude ourselves to believe we would be able to understand the universe significantly better than ants, apes of fish.

Imagine a New Man, one fitted with extra senses and bigger brains. This man would live in a wholly different reality than ours. Just like the reality that ants experience, his senses force this new man to interpret reality differently. Would ants be able to describe their reality to us, it would appear alien to us. We wouldn't understand a thing of it. We no longer share the same senses and therefore we no longer have a frame of reference.

For starters, an individual ant cannot perceive a human being as a human being, but at most as a surface it can climb over. Man, on the other hand, can observe the ant. A butterfly perceives a human being as a sort of walking tree trunk

with branches, limbs, it can land on. The ant and the butterfly are much more a part of our reality than the other way around. Contrariwise, we wouldn't be able to perceive the New Man in his true shape, even if he would still look like us in appearance. We wouldn't discover anything human about his behavior. Through his eyes, we would look like animals.

The point is, by no means can we assume that our senses can observe the real reality at all. To that purpose, our brains and our senses are no better equipped than the antennas of insects. Even if there really were a real reality, we will never know it. Even Einstein couldn't.

16

Once again, the scientific error shows up here. Science can only measure the measurable reality. That which people perceive as measurable limits itself to the human sensory experience. Science can't measure the real reality at all, but only the apparent one, namely the one that still comes about through our senses. The idea of science that it could wipe man from its equations, and subsequently come into contact with reality in an independent manner, is wrong. Math is an invention of the human mind, not of reality. Laws of physics exist at the grace of scientific consensus and will continually change. Just as the laws of Euclid and Newton were declared invalid by later scientists such as Einstein, future scientists will also find ways to refute Einstein's laws. There is no definitive scientific consensus.

It's incorrect to say that science has reached an endpoint with Einstein. That would have to imply a static reality, unchangeable and measurable. A dynamic reality, one in which the laws of physics do indeed change, such as Heraclitus'

stream that is never the same twice, undermines all science, but precisely this dynamism guarantees that such a thing as reality can exist at all.

Above all, the possibility of a universe that wasn't born on t=0, but somewhere halfway history, whereby a history grew backward and a future forwards on both sides of the present, denies the possibility that science will ever be able to know reality. We don't know if our entire history was falsified in hindsight. That's not impossible, and that's my point because science can neither prove nor disprove such madness. The academic consensus is strictly human power struggle. Science will always continue to change. Evolution doesn't have a purpose, neither does science.

The idea that the academic-scientific consensus is moving in the direction of a Theory of Everything, after which science would have to abolish itself, is the most naive nonsense ever thought of because it presupposes a false progress towards some sort of singularity. That progress doesn't exist. The Theory of Everything assumes that the universe can be summarized in one single theory. That is the religious, improvable faith of universalists who believe that all variable things can be reduced to a single unchangeable formula. Universalism is a modern hype on par with the belief in a flat Earth; outdated.

By no means may we assume that science is anything other than a subjective measurement of reality, one that moreover only limits itself to the measurable reality and that must be interpreted by a very limited human mind.

Science still doesn't have a clue what time is. In the previous century, German philosopher Heidegger remarked that scientists can measure time ever more precisely thanks to their ever more refined measuring instruments, but that they still cannot define time. Where is the time particle? Time

receives ever smaller intervals, from milli- to microseconds and beyond, but always stays dichotomous. It is the human measuring equipment that makes the measure. Here is where a side effect of human perception emerges. Of its own, time doesn't have units such as seconds and minutes. Those are made up by people. By committing technology to time measurement, meaning by suspecting time of having units, we divide something into parts which is really continuous. In order to make time understandable to the human mind, we had to divide it into chunks ourselves. The fact we can apparently measure time ever more precisely still doesn't prove that time exists.

Perhaps time is part of the illusion of an apparent reality projected by our own mind?

17

Imagine an elastic cord that can keep pulling out indefinitely, but which constantly requires more power to do so; the law of diminishing returns. Man keeps inventing more powerful scientific equipment in order to stretch that elastic—the scientific knowledge of the universe. Scientists theorize that, someday, there would come an end to the stretch and that they will reach this endpoint withing several generations. This way, however, science well never arrive at the idea that there is no such thing as a finite stretch in that elastic at all. The observation that it costs ever more energy to pull out the elastic makes us believe, in a totally unjustified manner, that there would exist an endpoint, a smallest unit of length of the elastic. But just as in the case of time, this elastic doesn't have units. It is an infinite continuity repeating itself.

Science wants to measure the length of the maximally stretched out elastic but doesn't see through the meaninglessness of that task. In the same manner, I present reality as something that can stretch infinitely. It's the scientists who split up reality in theories. The fact that the variability of the scientific consensus is slowing down, because variation keeps requiring more thinking power, doesn't mean that scientists are working toward a Theory of Everything, let alone that we have almost reached it.

Science will never stop trying to stretch reality's elastic. Thanks to ever more powerful measuring equipment, it will continue to divide reality into ever smaller units, without ever discovering an absolutely smallest unit. After molecules came atoms, electrons, then quarks, pions, bosons, etc. I predict that science will always discover smaller particles or forces, as far as human fantasy reaches. Eventually, the entire particle model may be rejected in favor of something else. We will never run out of models, the consensus will always change.

Reality is an infinite psychological fool in which man has lost himself. Science will only become scientific by distancing itself from reality.

The same holds true for time. Rather than measuring what time is, scientists only measure how time itself behaves. But at most, the fact that we can keep dividing time into ever shorter intervals says that reality is elastic. Time is a figment of human imagination in order to help him better understand movement and time. Isn't human technology simply an expression of the human desire to prove the observation he animated himself?

We call observations real because a machine has measured them, but the fact that the machine is an extension of the human senses precisely rejects the realness of the obser-

vation. A being with senses we cannot imagine to have would be able to build a machine of which we could never understand the results, just as ants on Earth will never learn to use the human internet. What good would it do to an ant to be able to communicate with other ants on the other side of the Earth? And why do people benefit from that? The internet is an extension of the human being and can only serve the nature of man. Reality isn't universal. We worship technology in the same way that primitive men worshiped nature gods.

Time, for now, remains a human tool to measure a changing reality, but why exactly is that reality changing? Does time dictate the change, is time its consequence, or are time and changeableness one and the same thing? Do we unwittingly use two words to indicate the same thing? Without time, there wouldn't be existence. Time helps people measure the difference in speed between two changing matters. Those changes only crystallize in our mind.

It isn't necessary at all for time to exist outside of man. If time appears to be an illusion of the human mind, that wouldn't change anything about scientific measurements. It wouldn't make a difference whether time exists. Someone who would create a universe according to the principle of minimally viable parts would simply put time in the heads of people. Why would a creator take the trouble to invent time if the illusion thereof suffices? Time exists in the film projector, not in the film.

18

Time is an illusion, animated by the human mind in order to suggest a changeable reality that is not really there. Not only is reality an apparent reality, our senses awaken that apparent

reality themselves. Isn't the size of the universe related to the ego of the scientist who presents it as such? Isn't it the case that all that we call reality only exists in our consciousness and not outside of it? And that our consciousness is itself part of that illusion, like a thought that was first thought of and imagined by itself?

If that were true, how come different people still observe the same reality? How, then, does the consensus about what we seem to experience as reality come into being? That doesn't have to be the case at all. Our realities don't have to be identical, but only the communication in between. If the communication between two realities has adjusted itself to one another, meaning either an innate or a learned translation, then people who experience different versions of reality can still communicate with each other, without ever knowing that we inhabit different realities.

People do this every day with language. No two people speak the same language, because we all have a different vocabulary, and, more importantly, a different past. Because life experiences differ from person to person, the same words can never really be understood in the same manner. Yet we can communicate with them. Trees in Africa look different from those in Northern Europe. Still, we can use the concept of the tree to communicate something from which we can saw wood and of which we can climb onto. The communication succeeds because the concept tree is so broad and vague that it overlaps part of both realities. All words in human language have to possess a certain vagueness. Otherwise, we cannot communicate with them. Only with partially overlapping communication can inhabitants of two different realities communicate with each other.

Would we decide to communicate in very precise details, then an African and a European, for example, could no

longer understand each other at all, not even in translation. A talking shark, on the other hand, would have no understanding of a tree, because these do not occur in its world of experiences. Even in the case of people, communication hits into this wall. We can easily communicate about shared matters, but very difficultly about matters either we or the other person don't know about. People with strongly different life experiences can understand each other less and less. So, one person who has survived catastrophes believes in the struggle for existence, while another who has only known prosperity believes in hedonism because he thinks he can afford it. In both cases, man fits his understanding of reality to his world of experiences.

Every person, every thinking life form has the ability to add something to the changing reality, meaning to change it through creative, destructive or transformative activity. Each of these individual projects clashes with all others into what we experience as our collective, shared reality, a consensus that came into being in an entirely decentralized manner. There is no such thing as The Reality, but only a changing consensus, the piece of shared reality in which all individual realities overlap each other, and this not even in a clearly delineated manner, but in a diffuse manner. At no time can a human being determine his reality. The fact that we keep a shared reality in the air, like a juggler, would explain why we experience our reality as changeable and thus why we experience time. Human thinking and doing animate time. We experience time because we first threw time out in front of us.

The changes we believe to observe in reality are really changes we first aroused in ourselves, consciously or unconsciously. We experience the world in reverse. To us, the projected reality appears to be made up of energy and matter that all people observe equally. But that really isn't the case.

Even today, large groups of people believe that the Earth is flat. Others believe that their ancestors once slung a gourd into space in order to create the moon. Tribes in the Brazilian rain forest that have had little to no contact with the outside world maintain an image of their reality that must be quite bizarre to us. The fact that Western science contradicts that indigenous worldview doesn't prove that the reality of primitive tribes was less real. Both are a projection of a communal self. Both are appearance.

There are multiple simultaneous realities that blend with each other and that compete with each other for validation. We must no longer speak of 'the' reality, but of a dynamic sum of all possible realities.

19

The concept of God evolved alongside man. In the beginning, this God lived as a spirit in the plant and animal world, the animism. Later, for example, Greek and Roman gods received separate personalities, living on top of clouds or on top of the Olympus. These Gods lived above people and above nature. They became projections of unfulfilled human needs. We create the God we wish to emulate, wrote Eric Hoffer. Later still, these polytheistic gods were molten together into one single God, one who could no longer suffer other gods beside him—the most intolerant idea man ever conceived of. This God then created his own heaven and secluded himself, as an unchangeable eternity, from people.

The question is not how old the universe is, but whether the universe existed before the first human observation? Did the universe come about around thirteen billion years ago, because we wanted to observe a universe in the Now?

Did Copernicus create the round Earth and Galilei the solar system? Does the scientist function as an ignorant creator of his own observations? Reality came into being as a self-assuming and self-assumed assumption, as a self-observed and self-observing observation. The universe rests on itself rather than on nothing. Reality is both observer and observation at the same time. Reality is the observing and the perceived at the same time.

In case the thinking mind animates his own reality, this reality doesn't really exist but is a collectively carried projection. That's because we all evolved together. We have adjusted our perceptions to one another, the translation. We also grew up in a consensus predefined by our ancestors, to which we can only add and take away. This has limited our personal experience since the time of our childhood. As very young children, we were taught the crucial contradictions that would come to shape our reality.

It is difficult to break free from that. More than merely an arbitrary morality concerning good and evil, we mainly learn about what we ought to accept as our reality and what not. We learn to make a distinction, for example, between past, present and future, a distinction that isn't really there. Our brains, which project an entirely own reality, do so according to learned guidelines. According to the linear image of reality, there ought to have been a First Mover. The universe came about in and out of itself, not from a God standing free from it.

If each observer lives in his own projection and we can adapt the translation between to each other by growing up together, can one observer still make some part of his unique perception known to the other observer? How might we see something of each other's reality? At the very least, people can create a new reality together. Two people who are in love

rewrite their realities into one new reality, one in which they act together from then on. We can fine-tune our individual realities to those of others, even without fusing with that other. Political movements synchronize groups of people who are creating a wholly new reality together, a separate, changeable consensus that partly or largely deviates from all others.

Multiple consensuses fight each other for the right to validation and so create the apparent reality all participants observe, in other words, what we generally call the Present. That which we call history appears to have a meaning, but it is a negative one: the dynamism that writes history makes sure that no single consensus can dominate forever. No single empire will exist forever. No single belief or ideology will always hold true. Inevitable ruin is the price the universe pays for its existence; death is the price people pay for life.

It is possible that one reality transmits a more powerful synchronization signal than the other. The power that realities represent doesn't have to be equal. Multiple realities can also act together as an alliance. Such more dominant reality consensuses exert a force of attraction to others, to individuals, followers or believers. The act of giving birth to children serves more than mere apparent biological reproduction, but especially the irreversible continuation of a possibly changeable reality, an attempt to propagate one's own consensus. The apparent reality is in a continuous state of being born. Here we recognize the opportunity for corruption. The one, weaker reality can penetrate the other, stronger one and control it from within. There are competitors on the horizon. Strong and weak appear to be relative concepts that flow over into each other.

20

If our reality holds us captive, then how can we escape from it? The miraculous thing about what we call reality is that both science, philosophy, religion, as well as horse sense reckon things among reality of which the existence has never been proven by anyone. Actually, everything is energy, but even the idea of energy is just a projection of thinking minds. The atom, once proposed as a small round orb, now appears to be a disjointed phenomenon of electrons, protons, and neutrons. Time and space occur in our head, not outside of it.

If space is an energy that only makes itself known as spaciousness through our senses, then why do we invent measuring tape and rulers to measure that space energy? Where is the scientific equipment to measure space as energy instead of as a physical dimension? What kind of use does science have if it can't even develop the necessary equipment to measure that reality outside of man? If science can measure time, but can't measure what time is, if it can measure space, but not what space is, gravity, but not what gravity is, then science isn't scientific. It feigns that the apparent reality is the real one.

The matters of time, space and gravity are projections of our mind. They only exist in our ratio, in our head, the place where our senses come together, an illusion that convinces itself. The observer doesn't know that he himself is the observation, just like a cat that runs after its own tail and doesn't get the message that it is its own tail. The scientist runs after a reality he first helped create himself, but which came about in such a complex manner that the creator no longer recognizes his creation. The road from creator to creation is one of irreversible one-way traffic.

Human technology only measures values that lie in the extension of what man can understand with his limited senses. Would we obtain alien technology, it would produce measurement values we cannot understand. We would think the technology was broken and try to fix it so that it produces values we do understand, but, in that case, the alien insights will forever remain hidden to Earthly minds. That is precisely what scientists do when they say to catch all sorts of contingencies and exclude contamination. They keep refining the data until they understand the data, but if they still can't understand the data after months, years or even centuries of hard labor, then suddenly the data is called white noise, even if many treasures remain to be found in it.

Not in logic, but in incomprehensible noise forever lies hidden the biggest understanding. Man doesn't know his limitations, because he is preoccupied with his arts. The tail the cat pursues appears to be elastic. By definition, explaining away data with new theories is an infinite activity. Someday, all our present theories, including the scientific consensus, will be repudiated again. The idea that science will lead to a Theory of Everything is an illusion.

Science began with the idea to want to understand the world without human interference, but it hasn't begun to be scientific. Humanity is still waiting for the first truly scientific measurement, namely the measurement of what time, space or gravity are. Imagine reality as an infinitely varying television show. We can keep studying that show for an indefinite period of time, keep formulating an infinite amount of scientific insights about it, keep forming an endless amount of religious assumptions concerning it, keep making endless observations and work out endless philosophies, but without ever having understood the technology behind that television.

The unanswered question is what is behind our reality, to the extent that there is something behind it at all? What is reality, if it is really anything at all? What is projecting our reality if our reality itself isn't the projector? Science must first prove itself by having all of its measurement repeated by a primitive forest tribe that hasn't been in contact with the modern West before. The bushmen will come to wholly different insights, theories, and philosophies that irrevocably reject ours. With ease, they will show our reality isn't theirs. There is no such thing as a universal reality.

According to one categorization, man has five senses, according to another, more. No matter how many there are, we cannot easily add new senses to ourselves that we didn't have before. That says something about how people are locked up in their sensory reality. But the question for a sixth sense is really a catch-question, because in what do the first five senses really differ? Is it the case that there exist five different attributes of reality that we observe through these coincidental senses? Is reality perhaps made up of categorically different forms of energy that our senses have adapted to? It's more obvious that the five senses each observe the same energy. With our senses, each time we measure the same apparent reality, but each sense only senses a limited part of that reality.

21

By definition, the sensory reality is so stubborn that we confuse our sensory perceptions with reality. We don't know any better and cannot know any better. This stubbornness perhaps expresses itself in hedonism. By ceaselessly bombarding our senses with increasingly stronger stimuli, we give ourselves a false belief in the realness of our reality. We become

addicted to the simulation in our own head. We look for bright lights, loud music, sex rites, gastronomic bombardments and artificial perfumes to emphasize to ourselves how real impressions supposedly are. The stronger the stimuli, the more stubborn we begin to believe in the simulation of reality.

The need to experience stimuli lures people from the countryside to the big city, where there's more to do, namely more people to gain more sensory experiences with. We are driven by a deep insecurity concerning our reality. By bombarding our senses, we ensure ourselves of the fact that reality is still real. It reassures us. It drives people to disturb serene silence with pathological chatter, rest with needless action. Man doubts his reality, but finds that doubt unpleasant and wants to drown it with an extravagance of stimuli.

Especially in the modern world, the majority of all people huddle together as sardines in noisy cities where man can hardly escape the constant attack on his senses. Once cozy folkcafé's fill up their insecure spaces with bumpy music as if that make the café experience more genuine. Where does this constant need to 'want to belong' come from if it isn't pure insecurity about an uncertain reality? In large parts of Europe, East Asia and elsewhere, we can no longer escape from the rustle of highways. Because our senses are our only contact with the outside world, busy cities change our idea and our expectations of reality. As long as there is noise outside, we feel we are a part of something. That outside world must be action-packed. We no longer experience rest as life but as death. That's a sign of despair. Man is in the process of losing himself in sensory overload.

By bombarding his senses with excessive eating, drinking, talking or moving, man is trying to reassure his reality. The fact that man pursues this very strengthening of his sen-

sory reality says something about what real reality must really be: sensory. The apparent reality is the real one, the rest is added to it. Nietzsche already knew that.

22

Mathematics introduced the concept of infinity (∞), but this infinity only exists in mathematical abstraction. Nowhere in the universe do we experience a tangible infinity. Time and space are finite. The universe we live in has a limited size of about 13.8 light years. The universe has its origin in the Big Bang or some other moment of creation. We live in the Now, but an infinite future hasn't yet taken place. On Earth, we measure time along tangible events such as the Earth's rotation, in days around itself and in years around the sun. Time is movement. That movement changes each year. Time is something changeable, but if time moves and changes, eternity must be movable and changeable. Eternity is infinite time.

What is that thing which infinitely moves and changes?

We can say a lot about the fact that the universe will continue to expand itself indefinitely as if the Earth will continue to revolve around the sun indefinitely. But any given moment between now and infinity, the universe won't have reached its infinite size yet. The fact the universe might continue expanding potentially infinitely doesn't mean that it will someday indeed be infinitely big. The size of the universe will always be finite, no matter how big. The eternally expanding universe can only be infinitely big at an infinite time. But we will never reach that time, so we cannot say that the infinite universe is a physical possibility, but only the idea of abstract mathematics.

At most, the universe can approach its infinite size, but it can never reach it. At this moment, there is nothing man can observe that is truly infinite. At each point in time, the number of atoms in the universe is finite, even if the number could infinitely double at any moment. We can only represent infinity as a symbol. The human mind can imagine an infinity that is not really there.

The universe we live in plays with infinity as if it is the expression of an own will, but this will always appear to be an illusion. The universe expresses its will to infinity in various manners, such as, for example, the illusion of an infinite surface of spherical celestial bodies. Because the surface of the Earth is continuously changing, and because the surface is spherical, an immortal wanderer on an immortal Earth will never make the exact same observation twice. Seen from the dimension of time, the Earth's surface is infinitely varied. If this wanderer would have a bad memory and believe the Earth is flat, he might think the Earth's surface is infinitely big. So infinity comes about as an illusion animated by the human senses, rooted in finality.

The universe, too, has an apparently infinite surface, namely the inside of the outer membrane, whether or not that membrane really exists. That surface, too, appears to be infinitely large. Due to the curvature of the universe, a spaceship flying through space at an infinite speed would keep returning to the same point. The apparent infinity is locked up inside the universe. An indestructible spaceship might circle around the universe an infinite number of times without ever reaching the proverbial end of the world. As in Heraclitus' saying that someone can never step into the same stream twice, so a spaceship can never fly through the same universe twice. Both you and the stream have changed. The apparent-

ly eternal stream of time animates an illusion of infinity without actually being (or having to be) infinite.

The senses of an immortal wanderer leave him with the illusion of living on an infinite surface, but in reality, he is living on a changeable, finite and spherical surface. The surface is both finite and infinite. Finite as a tangible surface, infinite as an experienced variation. Our universe expresses the need to desire to be infinitely big but maintains a finite size at any given moment. The universe sells us an apparent infinity, the energetically cheaper solution with the same effect.

Even if, theoretically speaking, the temperature of a star could be infinitely high, there would still be a highest known temperature in the universe that would be finite. There is no infinite temperature; at the time of measurement, the highest possible temperature in the universe has an exact value that is less than infinite. The universe counts an exact number of atoms or particles. Despite the appearance, there is an infinite number of them. Does the universe deceive our senses or do our senses animate the deception?

Time plays an important role in that deception. Without infinite time, nothing could be infinite, except for the absolute Nothing. It is the time factor that makes we can say things like, "If the universe becomes infinitely old, it will grow infinitely big." Without time, there's no eternity. Eternity cancels out all finality. Until then, only the Nothing can be infinite, namely in its being-nothing. Time is the thing that gives all other things the potential to be infinite. Time is eternity and eternity is time.

I find the belief that mathematics can exists outside of man nonsense. It isn't true that mathematics controls the laws of the universe. It is the human sensibility that suspects the universe of harboring mathematical laws. Those laws don't necessarily have to exist. We perceive a mathematics where

there is really none. Mathematics only exists in man himself, not outside of him. Is it man who controls the laws of the universe? If so, how?

Without time, people cannot experience reality. Isn't it the case that an object moving infinitely fast is just standing still? Is perhaps time in everyday language another word for reality and do we, for cultural reasons, attach a different meaning to it? In this sense, the following words are suspect, because they all point to one and the same idea: time, infinity, eternity, space, reality, movement. Different words that mean one and the same thing, namely a metaphysical non-Something. What is the sum of all the non-Nothing? It, too, is nothing.

23

A crucial insight into our reality rests on two interpretations of infinity. One the one hand, it rests on the apparent, at first sight, cyclical infinity, such as for example of the seasons or the life stages of man. On the other hand, it rests on the concept of linear infinity, such as that of an infinitely expanding space. German philosopher Martin Heidegger justifiably wondered whether the Western idea of linear time was the right one, rather than the Eastern cyclical one, but he failed to see the bigger insight that both concepts are simultaneously true. The cyclical and linear concepts of time are two sides to the same story. Just as time and space are spacetime, according to Einstein, the cyclical and linear time concepts are really one cyclical-linear concept.

Concerning linear infinity, there are three possible modes of origin. A linear beginning can lie in the past, with an arrow toward the future. The beginning can also lie in the

future, with an arrow toward the past. But there can also be two arrows toward both the future and the past, whereby the point of origin lies in the present. Our reality knows this third variant. All time begins in the present. The past is but a memory, the future but a dream—both are thoughts.

The linearly infinite worldview with its beginning in the past presupposes infinite time. Western science chose the Big Bang or something similar as its origin. The great religions chose their beginning with God's decision to create reality. According to that reading, philosophy, and science only began much later. Somewhere halfway a time current, philosophy jumped into the human waters and went with the flow without swimming back to the source.

The cyclical infinity isn't infinite. A circle is finite for one who sees it, but infinite for one who cannot see it. An infinitely large circle is an uninterrupted straight line. There is no difference between an infinitely large circle and an infinitely long straight line. That's because the infinitely large circle only begins to curve at a horizon infinitely far away. The factor infinity unites the circular with the linear. Even with less than infinite circles, the naked human eye experiences them both as a straight line. The senses play the main part in the falsification of reality.

When we subject the cyclical apparent infinity to eternal change, it becomes linearly infinite, such as an immortal person that strolls across the changeable Earth for centuries and never makes the exact same observation twice. The linear reality is encapsulated within the circular. Despite that the circle, the Earth, is finite and knows a finite surface, a simple local observer can still observe this as linearly infinite. The dimensions of time and space together create the illusion of infinite change.

24

That which we call reality is eternally changing finality. But this eternal changeableness is still the one we perceive with our senses, not the real reality of which we haven't proven its existence yet. Why does reality never fall back into a previous state? Why does time seem to have an arrow from past to future? The irreversible nature of the eternally changing reality gives something away about what reality really is.

As said, the cyclical and linear infinity aren't two qualitatively distinct categories, but two human views of one and the same cyclical-linear infinity. Linear is circular and circular is linear. Only the observer makes the difference. The observation connects all of the cyclical with the linear; the observer himself is infinite.

What, then, is that unseen, imperceptible archetype of all cyclical-linear infinity? If cyclical infinity is the result of the observation of infinitely changing linear finality, then the linear infinity can also exist without an observer, but the cyclical one cannot. It is the observer who suspects an infinitely long line of being an infinitely large circle. Both forms of infinity exist simultaneously as one thing. Both forms exist at the mercy of eternal change. The mind of the observer creates his own reality.

Is it possible that the thing we call infinity in our languages is really the same thing as that which we call spacetime? The human vocabulary contains many different words for the same thing. The confusion makes it difficult to decipher the underlying truths. Water, ice, and vapor are all water molecules moving at different speeds and distances from one another.

Because people grew up, evolved, in reality, we couldn't have known any better than to divide a bigger thing into

smaller things. It is the specialist mind of the academic who divides an otherwise indivisible reality into arbitrary categories. He does this because he doesn't know the greater whole. By separating the reality animated by the senses from physical man, we lose ourselves in a trap. From an irreversibly split reality, we could no longer trace back what that real reality ought to have been.

Many words in human vocabulary aren't grounded in evidence, but are so big and so abstract that we uncritically assume them to be true: time, reality, eternity, infinity, (free) will, consciousness, the human spirit, God, future, past, present, fate. The pseudo-infinity of our reality expresses a will to conquer the Nothing for all eternity. Might will be the same thing as time? A God that was always there, isn't that another name for infinity? Are Something and Nothing the same thing? Where does the idea for infinity come from? Did we discover the idea or was it invented by mathematicians? In any case, we didn't find it in reality.

How can a human being attribute things such as will and infinity to his reality if such things don't really exist? Why would a deterministic whole subject itself to such a tantalizing condition? The deterministic and the non-deterministic worldview point toward one and the same thing. They are both true at the same time, in the same manner that the cyclic-deterministic and linear-progressive realities are not each other's opposite, but each other's components. Does the tantalizing condition betray something about the nature of human existence, namely that it is really impossible? Was reality animated by an assumption resting on nothing? But who or what, then, makes that assumption, if it isn't the assumption that assumes itself?

What kind of thing can suspect its reality of being infinite, unless it was infinity itself to do so?

Is everything we call reality an assumption grounded in itself, circularly infinite, perceived by people as linear, *a self-assumed assumption assuming itself*? Reality rests on itself and so it is both Something and Nothing. Reality is less than an illusion; reality is merely a thought. By infinite approximation, reality and the Nothing are the same things. This can explain how something can come from nothing at all, because, on average, the Something is Nothing. That sounds a lot stranger than it is, but picture the Nothing as the surface of an endless sea, which, because of its infinity isn't stably plane, but scattered with smaller and bigger waves that cancel each other out perfectly. On average, the surface is perfectly plain. Still, it is in motion, always and everywhere. The energy that powers the waves didn't come from the Nothing but comes about because there's an equal amount of negative energy elsewhere.

If we influence our own observations, or if we even animate them in a totally one-sided manner, then it is possible that the whole of science with all its research, measurements and theoretical thinking has fallen into a mean trap, a trap for scientists looking for a measurable reality that creates its own measurements as one goes looking for measurements. Human science appears to be a concatenation of centuries of self-deception.

25

Precisely why does the Nothing produce universes? Is everything that comes about in the Nothing always a universe? Religious people can simplify the matter, "The rose has no why; it blossoms because it blossoms." (Angelus Silesius) No wonder that religious people suspect science of suffering a

degree of foolishness. Contrariwise, science accuses religion of relying on circular arguments. But it seems there is no escape to either pattern of thought. Aren't both a part of a more uniform whole? Science takes the observable as its source of truth, religion the First Mover. Does one hold truer than the other?

Science follows linear infinity and will always continue to make new discoveries. It isn't the measurable reality that slows down new discoveries, but the increasingly complex scientific consensus that only exists in the heads of scientists. It is the human mind that holds back new discoveries. Only by overthrowing the existing consensus as a whole can a scientist make new discoveries. That's why the scientific world so massively resists eccentric thinkers who do precisely this.

The more obedient science student must, before making his own discovery, learn about more and more preliminary investigations. The student has increasingly less time available to do research. It is the growing mental ballast that prevents scientists from making new discoveries. The human mind is the *bottleneck*, the limiting factor.

Religion, on the other hand, will always be able to defend its assumptions, because it represents the circular infinity, the eternally returning God. What if science and religion really are the same thing? What is that thing that we cannot see? Without damaging our face, we can never see ourselves. A glance in a mirror shows a mirror image, but we can never directly observe our own face, at least not without pulling an eye out of its socket. A reflection is only a reflection, *ceci n'est pas une pipe*. The observer cannot observe himself. The observer takes part in the observable without being able to observe himself.

What is this "observer that cannot observe himself" if it isn't our own consciousness? To be conscious means: to

know that we are the observer, but in order to do so, we don't have to observe ourselves directly. Rather than observing ourselves, we assume ourselves. Consciousness is the assumption that we are separate from the observable. We stay relatively unchanged, while the world around us changes.

26

What's wrong with the scientist who wants to answer what time is, but then focuses on the direction of time? The direction or the arrow of time points from a higher order with a lower entropy to a lower order with a higher entropy. A popular argument to show the direction of time from past to future is, for example, breaking an egg in order to make an omelet. It is more difficult to turn the omelet back into an egg, perhaps impossible. One might put the omelet's atoms, released during the frying, etc., back into an egg, one by one. We find another proof supporting the direction of time in the existence of irreversible mathematical formulas from cryptography. Such formulas transform multiple parts into a solution, but, with only the solution, the original parts can never be retrieved again. The formula is irreversible.

The fact that such irreversibility occurs in the universe says something about the nature of our reality.

Another popular argument in support of the direction of time is that we can remember the past, after all, but not the future. This isn't entirely so. We can speculate about the future and remember that fantasy later. In that case, we 'remember' the future. In some cases, our speculation comes true. In that case, we have 'remembered' the future correctly. Then what is the difference with remembering the past, especially if those memories aren't perfect either? How many

people color in their memories with speculation and fantasy? Are future and past the same thing?

The past is just as improbable as the future. The chance I will get up tomorrow isn't unknown, but very likely. But the chance that I stood up this morning is probably too, and not certain. I mean to say that the past isn't knowable, because we cannot travel back in time and confirm with one hundred percent certainty that I indeed got of out bed this morning. The further back in time the past lies, the less certain the pronunciations historians can make about them. A large part of all study of antiquities relies on fantasy.

The point is that the past is just as unknown and unpredictable as that which we call the future. That's because the universe we live in doesn't carry within it a copy of the past. There is no hard-disk on which the universe stores the past. We cannot rewind time. The only thing that remains of the past is the memory thereof in the present moment, both mentally (memories) and physically (photos, ruins, fossils, etc.), but both matters are subject to decay. Both our memory and the present suffer losses. There are many things we cannot remember. Many ruins are lost. A selective memory means we continually interpret the past in different ways or that we give it entirely new meanings. After conquerors have subjected a people, they generally rewrite history in order to erase the memory of freer times.

But the fact that we cannot remember the past has something to do with what remembering is, not with what the past it. The future is no different from the past. They are both streams of thoughts in the minds of people. Past and future have a common ground in the past. But that we experience such a thing as the past doesn't prove that the past exists, nor that time has a direction. All past time is decayed time. Only a remainder of the past stayed with us in the present moment.

We can't remember a large part of the past anyway. We weren't born yet. We can only remember our own observation. That says something about what observing is and nothing about time. A time traveler who travels back in time to a point before when he was born can remember the future, namely his future life, but he can only speculate about the past. Speculation, fantasy, memory—they are quantitatively different thought processes, but in a qualitative sense, they are made of the same thought substance. To remember something means to make a fairly rough recording of the impressions of reality that have manifested themselves in our brains, but which, like a nuclear halftime, lose clarity as time proceeds. Some memories stay crystal clear, others blur, others we make up ourselves.

The fact we can't remember the future doesn't mean that the future doesn't exist yet either, nor that there exists such a thing called Future. Who says a well-thought representation of what I am about to have for lunch, whereby I mentally pick the restaurant I will visit and go through the menu in my head in order to have a sandwich with fried egg and ham, is any less true than my best memory of yesterday? Then aren't future and past the same thing too, namely ideas in the present moment?

27

Concerning the concept of entropy, it remains a question of what order is. What about a balloon I inflate, of which I subsequently suck the air back into my lungs, so that the balloon returns into its original state and all air is back in my lungs. Where, now, the balloon considered on its own, is the change in entropy? The balloon begins and ends in the

same state. Only the memory of the inflated condition exists in my thoughts. No one else has seen me inflate the balloon. Where, now, has the arrow of time gone, as we saw earlier in the egg that transformed into an omelet? This arrow proves itself to be human assumption. Entropy, in other words, the irreversibility of time and reality, isn't a physical property of that which we observe, but an aspect of the observer himself. It is the act of observation that creates that irreversibility, it is man who creates time.

In the above example with the balloon, it is, of course, true that the system as a whole suffers heat or energy losses. The person who inflates and deflates the balloon loses energy. The system as a whole possesses the entropic arrow. But the balloon, isolated, does not. Time as we perceive it manifests itself on a human scale. We use the idea of time in order to give perfectly stationary objects a time. For example, "The molecules have been stationary for six hours at zero degrees Kelvin." This statement is false. At perfect standstill, there is no more time. Time isn't part of physical reality, but of the observer who reasons from his own reality.

Neither the future nor the past is fixed. Future and past are one and the same thing: thoughts. Because the past remains just as undetermined as the future, we cannot offer evidence of the existence of such a thing as a direction of time. We, people, project an arrow of entropy, a direction of time, where there is none.

28

A computer programmer can easily program an infinite, virtual world by having a finite world programmatically repeat itself with continuous minor changes. It's possible to use sim-

ple routines to create the suggestion of infinity, without actually having to program the infinite. A computer doesn't have an infinite memory and no infinite processing capacity. Yet, a computer can generate a game world that is always changing—pseudo-infinity.

Doesn't the universe work that way as well? Is our reality a mere suggestion, a projection based on far simpler routines? That sounds like an attractive proposition because that would mean we might perhaps hack into the underlying program and rewrite it. I reject that possibility. Our reality doesn't have a program, and no programmer, but it is the suggested human being who suggests himself. Reality's computer and its computer game create each other, are dependent on each other, assume one another and support one another.

I will explain as follows how this is possible. Suppose a leader leads the way for his followers. The followers assume their leader knows the way because he appears to be leading. The assumed leader, on the other hand, assumes that the road he is leading his followers to must be the right way because his followers appear to follow him! So, he no longer doubts his leadership and even believes to be a born leader. Leader and follower perceive each other differently, without those differences being real. Nobody appointed the leader. Nobody ordered the followers to follow him. It all just occurred in people's heads. The two roles are assumptions based on each other. The behavior of the followers creates the suggestion that one of them must be the leader, namely the one they happen to be following. The leader simultaneously accepts his role and doesn't know any better. This double assumption, based on itself, the mutual assumption, the circular argument, explains nearly all phenomena that occur within the universe.

Because you can't base anything on Nothing, the Something had to base itself on itself. Each assumption about the operation of the universe has a mutually dependent counter-assumption. There is a future because there is a past. There is a past because there is a future. Past and future create each other, suggest one another. Our universe is full of circular arguments, phenomena that assume themselves and push other phenomena into other roles. Both sides of the story remain ignorant about it.

29

All science is human suspicion. We suspect the universe of having natural laws of physics, but then where are those laws encoded? Answer: nowhere. The universe doesn't have inherent laws at all. It's the observer who suspects the universe of having laws. The laws only exist in the observing mind. The scientific consensus is the result of human minds, not of physical properties of the universe.

Certain scientists, such as Paul Davis, worked on hypothetical models for alternative universes. This way, he wanted to try and learn something new about ours. Davis questions all possible laws of physics, but one thing he didn't do: each time he took his own senses as a given. Rather than simulating a new universe with different natural laws, we ought to mimic our own universe and try to observe it with different senses. Wouldn't the research result be identical? Isn't the universe as ants and butterflies perceive it as equally absurd as a parallel universe with different laws of nature would be to us?

The senses are just as important, if not more important, than alternative physical constants. Would man have been

able to prove Einstein's theory of relativity, let alone think of it, if life on Earth had evolved without the capacity for sight? Would blind moles with human intelligence have been able to think of the theory of relativity? And what does it mean that human life indeed evolved on Earth with eyesight?

Then we must question whether man, in case he had come into being with wholly different sense, wouldn't have discovered wholly different laws of physics and theories. We can't smell, taste or hear the sun. We can feel the sun's heat touching our skin and determine where the direction that heat comes from, but without eyesight, we would never understand that it came from a sun. We would never have seen stars and never have had the idea that the weight of the sun bends the light of the stars.

Not only is all science still very anthropocentric, because it is only practiced by people, but also strongly visually prejudiced. It would do science well to literally close its eyes and risk an attempt to try and understand the world outside of our senses. Yes, we can teach blind people the idea of stars. But, on an Earth where people had always been blind, no one would have thought of the idea of constellations. Stars might simply not have existed. How many other things are we missing, because we don't have the senses for it? Isn't it obvious that the specific senses we have bring color to our reality?

30

Reality is like a projector's lens that both transmits and receives. There is one thing that lens cannot perceive: itself. The projector's lens imagines itself to be a participant in the film it is projecting. But the projector neither recognizes the screen on which it projects itself, nor itself as the source of

the projection. This projector believes to be participating as an actor in the film it is broadcasting itself. The projector's lens, creator of its own creation, observer of its own observation, creator of its own reality, cannot know itself. The observer doesn't see himself. Just as people from birth to death can never see their own eyes without tools such as mirrors, the observing projector lens cannot observe itself.

The observer cannot observer himself. The act of observation is irreversible: *God does not know He is God*.

In the experiment of the alternative universes by Paul Davis, he assumed human observation as a given. This observation plays an essential role in the creation of what we experience as reality. Would we only be able to smell, and not touch, see, or hear, then how would our image of reality have been? We would have to communicate with smells and perhaps be able to discern summer from winter or work with entirely different seasons based on differences in smell. We couldn't recognize day and night, but we could graft our behavior onto wholly different circadian rhythms. These would be just as real to us then.

If all we could do was smell, we might detect changes in smell, but we wouldn't see or feel movement. Would we ever be able to think of the concept of speed for moving objects? Or would we only be able to understand movement in terms of varying intensities of smell? We would represent what we now call time in a very different way, namely not in relation to acceleration and deceleration, but as a measure for saturation of certain smells in relation to others.

With only a sense of smell, we wouldn't be able to smell the sun directly, nor the stars. We wouldn't have developed an understanding of celestial bodies, let alone of galaxies or the universe. Even the concept of spaciousness would elude us. We wouldn't be able to imagine a three-dimensional

world, because we didn't have eyes and antenna's to scan that spaciousness. What we call reality depends on our senses and not on some presupposed real reality.

If beings with greatly different senses could inhabit such greatly different realities, we must conclude that reality per se doesn't exist. There is no real reality.

Why would the five available senses known to us suffice to form a scientifically complete image of our reality at all? Might we be able to possess additional sixth, seventh and eight senses, presently unknown to Earth, that would make entirely new aspects of reality known to us? Those would be aspects that scientists haven't been able to measure either because those measuring instruments were limited in their design by what people can understand with their senses.

Would we possess those unknown senses, then we would develop scientific technology corresponding thereto. The idea of a ruler, for example, used to measure distance, relies on our ability to see things. Perhaps it's also possible to perceive spatial depth using antenna's or echolocation, but without such senses, we would be trapped in ourselves and we wouldn't be able to understand the idea of space.

With qualitatively twice as many senses, human knowledge of the apparent reality would have been exponentially bigger. Here, once again, lurks the infinity trap. We can have an infinite number of new senses or an infinite number of combinations of senses, and then be able to observe an infinite number of facets of reality. Why? Because the senses create them themselves. In no case would we have come to the same scientific consensus. Change the scientist's senses and change the scientific consensus.

31

Science wants to measure without human influence, but its measurements are still interpreted by people. People can never overcome their sensory reality because it is the only reality they will ever know.

Isn't it obvious that Western science projects a self-created reality, in which scientists act as the propagators of false infinity? Mustn't we admit that Hawking, famous for his theories on the origin of the universe, ex-ante always had the personal goal of proving a universe without a creator, meaning to create the creator-less universe himself? The scientific method only serves to fit one's own theory into the theories of many competing others. Top scientists know how to umbrella the opinions of mediocre ones, at least until a bigger name arrives at the scene who umbrellas those opinions too. The scientific method is a battle scene for clever minds who fight each other for validation of their thoughts. In no way can this lead to an understanding of real reality. Science is an ego-trip with, sometimes, practical applications.

It won't take decades and definitely not a century before a clever mind finds a way to debunk Einstein's theory of relativity. That happened before with the theories of Pythagoras, Euclid, and Newton. This will happen again by fitting Einstein's theory into a bigger understanding and consequently declaring it false, in part, because the exact meaning of Einstein's insights will then no longer be true.

The big names in science don't just want their theory to surpass those of others in explanatory ability, but also aim to have their theory hold true as long as possible. Each scientist strives for eternal fame. Nothing flatters a scientist more than winning a prestigious prize—recognition for his personality.

Nothing hurts a scientist more than seeing his own theory debunked right after winning that prize.

When we moved from Euclidean to Newtonian geometry, didn't our reality stay the same? Is it not the case that, in the time of Euclid, Euclidean geometry was indeed true? Is it possible, then, that man is the driving force behind his changing reality? I imagine reality as the outcome of a battle for consensus between human minds. Top minds exert a greater weight on the outcome than lesser ones, but nobody can determine the consensus on his own. Collaborating lesser minds can bring down a top mind. Science is an infinite struggle of minds that comes to an end as soon as human evolution has produced the last original mind. The chance that a newborn mind can surpass all others, as Einstein did, becomes increasingly smaller as human evolution progresses.

But the fact that the chance for new Einsteins is becoming smaller and smaller doesn't mean that there is less to discover about our reality. It only means that man has approached the limit to his ability to imagine. Another being, perhaps evolved from man, might be able to choose a different path. One will then forget the human scientific model again, after which the battle begins anew from different starting assumptions. The point is that the scientific consensus doesn't show any independent truth, but is the unique product of human history. What remains of human reality when man is extinct? At what insights might gifted dolphins arrive?

32

Some scientists looking for a Theory of Everything hope to discover one or more simple, elegant formulas that together govern the universe. For example, this idea is brought to

expression in Mandelbrot's fractal functions. Simple functions can produce infinitely self-repeating figures, which repeat themselves with small variations and are never twice the same.

For the same reason, science has hit a dead end. Suppose reality is governed by fractal functions. Can you, based on observations of such Mandelbrot figures, in this case, our reality, really decipher the original formulas? In some cases, yes, but from cryptography, we know that some encryption is irreversible. Considering such cryptographic one-way traffic occurs in our universe, the question remains how much of our reality has also been encrypted that way?

From an encrypted reality, we may never be able to deduce its principal functions. Man is trapped in his apparent reality. Even if that reality isn't encrypted, scientists can still be wrong on the basis of their historical consensus. Then we will have to wait for new culture and civilizations that go down new roads. But then the problem still remains whether the scientific End Theory is provable at all? Perhaps we're on the right track, but how do we prove that the consensus is right?

This means Einstein's insights don't describe base laws of our universe, but laws of our self-created universe. Does that reality have a genotype and a phenotype? All scientific formulas calculated by man describe the observable, the so-called physical reality, but they can never describe that which creates that apparent physical reality. Science perceives regularities in the phenotype of our reality without detecting an underlying genotype at all. That genotype remains forever hidden behind irreversible formulas.

33

What is movement? How do we perceive movement? If we were watching a so-called optical illusion, for example, a figure representing both a young and an old woman, most of us, at first sight, will see one of the two possibilities. We can also see the form as a whole, but then we don't recognize either of the intended expressions. Some of us see both possibilities continuously flowing into each other. They experience the young and the old woman as two lights flashing one after the other. It is the human mind that creates this movement. People who continuously see the two appearances observe a movement where this is none. Doesn't all movement in reality come about like that?

When I move my arm, I feel the effect thereof on my nerves. I can see my arm move and perhaps I can smell the sandwich in my hand. Nowhere can I observe the evidence that my hand really moved in reality. I can only become aware of the sensory information that my mind receives. Whether or not my senses are in contact with a real reality, I cannot determine. I can only accept as true the response I can observe through my senses. This cheaper or more efficient variant of our universe only exists in the ratio of thinking beings, but not really outside of it.

Man is forever trapped in his senses. A God that creates an apparent universe can suffice with illusion, an illusion He creates with His thoughts.

Imagine the image of a flower, drawn with black lines on white paper. Imagine a second image with only dots, which, in case we would mentally draw the lines between them, would represent that same flower again. He who only sees the dots and tries to overlay the flower in imagination processes an apparent flower into an apparently real flower in his

mind. Is the reality we experience a simulation of the human mind?

34

Both science and religion have a strange relationship with God. Science denies a creator and wants to prove this. Religion took God away from its disciples and placed Him above them. Thus, religious leaders claimed the sole right of speaking in the name of God. Is it possible that both are wrong? Is it possible that God exists in the blind spot that we cannot observe, namely in our own consciousness? The infinite pays the price for infinity by not being able to know itself.

Some claim God created the universe. Others claim God grew up in the universe a final product. Both views rest on the assumption that God and the universe are two different things. Is it possible that God is the same thing as the universe an that the senses we use to perceive things are God's senses? It is possible that God looks at His universe through our eyes?

Will someone tell Him?

Afterword

I didn't know where I would end up when I began writing my thoughts. Through detours, I arrived at an argument for an immanent God, in other words a God that lives in man and who feels and watches along with the human senses. This God doesn't know himself because he cannot know himself. God is the eternal observation that overcomes the Nothing by throwing himself into being in an irreversible manner. He does this by animating the life and the light in the universe. God is within man himself, not outside or above him.

This God is not that of Christianity, Islam or Judaism. The great religions have put God on a pedestal in heaven above the heads of people. The God of the great religions looks down on people. This God only speaks to man through His chosen prophets. That has given a religious cast endless power over laymen. Priests have hijacked the faith and taken God hostage.

The immanent God, on the other hand, is a humble one. It was Angelus Silesius who knew how to express this protest centuries ago:

> "That blessed without desires, God lives free,
> I both received from Him and He from me.
> I am as great as God, He is as small as I:
> No higher than I is He, nor I than He less high."